UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,291	1 04/05/2006 Edward J. Cheal		OLK-002.01	6942
25181 FOLEY HOAG	7590 05/12/200 r, LLP	EXAMINER		
PATENT GRO	UP, WORLD TRADE	SCHILLINGER, ANN M		
155 SEAPORT BOSTON, MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3774	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/12/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/595,	291	CHEAL ET AL.		
		Examin	er	Art Unit		
		ANN SC	HILLINGER	3774		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appears on t	he cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA Insions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commit period for reply is specified above, the maximum sta- re to reply within the set or extended period for reply very reply received by the Office later than three months af- act patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF T of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e unication. tutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap	THIS COMMUNI event, however, may a will expire SIX (6) MOI pplication to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,	
Status						
· ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed. This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice.	b)⊡ This action is for allowance excer	non-final. ot for formal mat	•	ne merits is	
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the alay and the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2 and 11-16 is/are rejecte Claim(s) 3-10 and 17-30 is/are object Claim(s) are subject to restrict on Papers The specification is objected to by the	e withdrawn from cd. d. ted to. tion and/or election				
_	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	tion to the drawing(s) the correction is requ	be held in abeya lired if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 (, ,	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P [*] mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	ГО-948)	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 		

Art Unit: 3774

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12-16 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11, 12, and 14-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,044,975 in view of Henssge et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,047,060). US Pat. No. 7,044,975 does not disclose a shaft with a tapered mid-section and a distal end with a rounded tip. However, Henssge et al. teaches a hip joint prosthesis with these features as shown in Figures 1-3 and columns 1 and 2. It is well-known in the art to use this type of shape for a joint prosthetic shaft as it better fits the natural bone's anatomy and requires less bone to be removed from the patient to implant the prosthesis. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a shaft with a tapered mid-section and a

Art Unit: 3774

distal end with a rounded tip in order to it better fit the natural bone's anatomy and remove less bone from the patient to implant the prosthesis.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-10 and 17-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the response to the non-final office action, filed 1/30/2009, with respect to the Schelhas reference and the provisional double patenting rejection under Application No. 10/605322 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/20/2009, with respect to the double patenting rejection under US Pat. No. 7,044,975 in view of US Pat. No. 5,047,060 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant has stated several deficiencies that are associated with a shaft having a tapered mid-section and a rounded end. However, at the time the invention was made, this kind of shape was regularly used in hip joint prosthesis because it better fits the natural bone's anatomy and requires less bone to be removed from the patient to implant the prosthesis. The examiner maintains that the implementation of a tapered, rounded shaft into the device of US Pat. No. 7,044,975 would have been an obvious modification to those having ordinary skill in the art because of the shape's regular and frequent use in the devices of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3774

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANN SCHILLINGER whose telephone number is (571)272-6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,291 Page 5

Art Unit: 3774

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3774

/Corrine M McDermott/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3738